

THE COLUMBIAN.

G. E. Howell, J. E. Dittenbender, Editors. BLOOMSBURG, PA. FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 1885.

Gen. Grant's war horses are turning up all over the country. There will soon be as many of them as there used to be of George Washington's nurses.

T. V. Powderly of Scranton who has been named as a candidate for State Treasurer by several democratic papers, has declined to allow his name to go before the convention.

Travis C. VanBuren is, since the recent death of Martin VanBuren, the President's grandson, the only male representative of the name made famous by the elevation of the great New Yorker to the presidency.

According to statistics collected by the Baltimore Sun, out of 3,377 murders committed last year in the United States, the perpetrators were punished in 315 cases, and 210 of these persons were hanged. Only one man in 33, therefore, is hung according to law in this great country, and one in about 15 by irregular methods. Ten out of eleven escape the gallows altogether.

The average cost of harvesting grain is said to be less in California than it has ever before. The combination harvesting machines have greatly reduced expenses, and the wages of labor this season are comparatively low. One farmer in the San Joaquin Valley reports that the cost of harvesting his crop this year has been only four cents a sack, whereas the cost of thrashing alone, under old methods, was as high as fifteen cents a sack. A saving of a few cents a bushel in harvesting, with wheat at low prices, may represent the difference between profit and loss.

It is probable that Mr. Carlisle will be elected speaker of the next Congress without opposition, and that his name will be presented by ex-Governor Curtin.

A Washington dispatch says: This courteous act on the part of Mr. Randall's best friend ought to disprove of the oft-recurring stories of his intriguing for the Spanish ship. It is a still greater significance among politicians, and that is in his hearing on tariff legislation this winter. Mr. Randall has already indicated his desire for a proper and thorough revision of the tariff, and indications point to a more harmonious action in respect to that and other legislation this winter. There will probably be a fair adjustment on both sides that a fair adjustment of the tariff may be had before the close of the Forty-ninth Congress.

The Morrison mafehst was held in great contempt by the Democrats who voted for it. With a majority reduced majority it will be necessary to control the fall vote of the party if any bill is passed, and this can only be done by a fair revision and not by a horizontal reduction. Under Mr. Carlisle the composition of the House committees will be very nearly the same as the last Congress. It could scarcely be better. Mr. Morrison will retain the committee on ways and means and Mr. Randall the appropriations, where his superior abilities find an ample field.

MEANS EDITORS: DEAR SIR:—In last week's issue of the Republican we see another humiliating spectacle—the editor lamenting the removal of a gangster. They talk very differently about electioneering. The time this good-morality party profess to scorn to hold office under a "moral reform" like President Cleveland. Now they cry like babies when a removal is made; this too after holding office for twenty-four years. It may be that I am wrong in applying to the Republican editor as editor, but I know of no man more prominent in his limited circle than this man. His attempt to write his spite on young McElroy because his father was falsely imprisoned as shown by the Columbia County History, and the acknowledgment of Charles Dodson that he had sworn falsely in a very bad taste, as every intelligent person (the Republican editor excepted) knows that these are the facts. The Democracy have a formidable rebellion to put down, viz: Republican extravagance and misrule; and they propose to do it effectually. They are ready to say I suppose we will hear nothing more from the Republican, as the person who rendered such efficient aid to the rebellion has just been appointed Postmaster at Cambria Pa. Horrible! Can't the Republican editor call on the military and have this misrule stopped? In conclusion, did the Republican editors ever encourage mob law in Bloomsburg, and call for ropes to hang certain Democrats who refused to bow with them, and suffering false imprisonment? The Republican editor is, we observe, very ready to market to records for Democrats. Will this loyal editor now give us his own bare record? Were you in the front fighting the battles for the Union, or were you at home persecuting innocent citizens? Come now, give us a square answer. CAMBRIA.

The Brookway Will Contest. THE ALLEGATION OF FORGERY SUSTAINED.

The hearing in the matter of the contested will of Beckwith S. Brock was held before A. W. Boyd, Register, at Wilkesbarre, last week Tuesday.

Senator Hagber, of Philadelphia, counsel for the plaintiffs, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

Charles B. Brockway also testified to the forgery of his father's name to the alleged will, and gave reason for knowing why the name was forged. His father never dictated the will, Charles B. and Frank E. Brockway, opened the case by calling Frank E. Brockway to the witness stand, whose testimony in brief was that the alleged will submitted for probate some years ago by Daniel F. Seybert, in which said Seybert was made the executor and beneficiary of the estate of Beckwith S. Brockway, deceased, is a forgery.

He was familiar with the handwriting of his father and also with the handwriting of Daniel F. Seybert, and recognized the writing on the will as the writing of Daniel F. Seybert. The signature to the will was not in the handwriting of his father, Beckwith S. Brockway.

THE COLUMBIAN AND DEMOCRAT, BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA.

It would help the case along any, he would help it to be a forgery. Theodore F. Craig was sworn and testified that shortly after the death of Beckwith S. Brockway, Daniel F. Seybert came to him and asked if he had any signature of the deceased in his possession; stating that his reason for desiring to secure different signatures of the deceased was that there was likely to be some trouble about certain papers that he had signed. Seybert scanned now, he wanted to fix things up so that he would not have any doubt of their being all right when the time came to settle up. That he, Craig, handed Daniel F. Seybert several papers containing the signature of Beckwith S. Brockway, the same being receipts, one of which Seybert took these receipts away with him.

He remembered a conversation with William W. Seybert about the will in which William stated that the whole thing was a forgery. That there was a difference between Daniel F. and William W. Seybert in 1874. It occurred one day while they were passing from one of Daniel's houses to another, both being on the same property; that Daniel insisted upon William paying him some money that he owed; that William reminded him that the agreement was that he should sign the forged will as a witness, that his debt to Daniel was cancelled and that in case the will got through all right and Daniel got the money from the insurance companies, a much larger sum (mentioning thousands) would be paid to William than if the will was not signed. Daniel would not hear to this and said he would issue an execution and compel William to pay. William said that he told Daniel then and there that he would expose the forgery of the will if Daniel attempted to collect the money. Daniel made a rash and angry remark that he would kill William if he exposed that will business. William stepped to one side and avoided the blow and picked up a stone to defend himself. Witness talked with Daniel afterwards about the quarrel that had occurred between him and William, and said that he would certainly kill William if he exposed anything.

C. F. Hill, an insurance agent from Hazleton, who wrote the policy of Beckwith S. Brockway in the Aetna Life Insurance Company, of New York, was called to the witness stand and requested to examine the will and state in whose handwriting the will was written. Mr. Hill said, after a careful examination of the writing, that he was of the opinion that Daniel F. Seybert had written the body of the will, and that the signature attached thereto was in the handwriting of William W. Seybert, but appeared to him to resemble the writing in the body of the will, which he was sure was written by Daniel F. Seybert; also upon cross-examination that while on his way home from Pottsville, after a trial, he saw the signature of William W. Seybert, who said to him that the note presented by Daniel to the court to prove that he had an insurable interest in Mr. Brockway's life, was a forgery, and that the will was no better.

This closed the testimony of the plaintiffs. Daniel F. Seybert, though present at the hearing in the court, declined to take any part in the examination of the witnesses or to be present by counsel. Counselor Hughes asked that the Register reject the probate of the will, as the evidence presented left no particle of doubt that the will was a forgery. After reading the testimony again, Register Boyd granted the prayer of the petitioners for the rejection of the will.

HISTORY OF THE CASE. About the year 1867 Daniel F. Seybert, of Beach Haven, indeed Beckwith S. Brockway, of the same vicinity, to have his life insured for the sum of \$40,000, of which \$20,000 were in the Aetna Life of New York, \$10,000 in the Connecticut Mutual Life and \$10,000 in the Mutual Benefit Life, of Newark, N. J. He was insured by the latter company in 1872 in the courts of Luzerne county. The matter was submitted to a referee—now Judge Hand—who decision was adverse to Seybert's claim on the ground that he had no insurable interest in the life of Brockway. Seybert then brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

New complications had arisen in the meantime between Daniel F. Seybert and William Wallace Seybert, who was the son of the former. In 1874, when he brought suit against the Newark company for the amount of its policy, \$10,000.

THE COLUMBIAN AND DEMOCRAT, BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA.

Following from the democratic table, few cranks from the democratic table, following from the number of prominent Senators and Newspaper men in the city last week, some powerful political influence must be exerted in order to bear on the President for appointments, which it was hoped he would make before leaving for his four weeks recreation in the Adirondacks. You need not therefore be surprised if some important appointments in the states are made during the President's absence, although it has been stated that he would take no political cares into the woods with him.

It has for years been the custom to leave departmental clerks thirty days leave of absence in a year, and thirty days additional "sick leave" with pay. But this has been changed so as to allow only thirty days in all. This leave has usually been taken in the summer months, but so far this year but few leaves have been applied for, compared with what have been granted in the same months in previous years. Many of the clerks are sure that if they should take a leave it might be extended indefinitely without pay, and so their courage to ask for it is very weak. But there is little need of any one leaving Washington in summer. At this season of the year the foliage, falling and shrubbery which adorn our circles and parks are in the height of their glory. The least obtrusive person can scarcely pass by them without being conscious of a pleasurable emotion.

A count just completed of the public buildings here, as listed at the Capital shows that there are about 700,000 of such documents stored there. There used to be a great demand for Agricultural Reports, but not such a large demand of late years, as most people have thought; for some years past there have been nearly 10,000 copies of each report made.

The Medical Museum, which occupies the old Ford's Theatre on Tenth street, made historic by the assassination of President Lincoln in it, is in luck. Congress at its last session appropriated \$200,000 for the erection of a new building. It is situated on the Smithsonian grounds, where it will stand alongside the Smithsonian and National Museum buildings—places well known to every person who has ever visited Washington. Bids just received for its erection range from \$170,000 to \$225,000.

The next building erected ought to be for the Library of Congress, so as to relieve the crowded condition of the Capitol building, and provide a safe repository for the thousands of volumes now stacked up so as to be inaccessible. Lieut. Greely's health is not as bad as is reported. He is recovering rapidly in Massachusetts, and expects to leave in October for Scotland, but his report on the Arctic expedition will be given to the public before he sails for that country. This report will be printed by the Government at its own printing establishment.

Great difficulty is experienced every winter in properly and economically heating the various government buildings here, many of which cover an area of over 90,000 square feet. With the view of remedying the evil a stock company has just been organized to construct a new heating system. The water is made to fill the pipes, and is heated above 212° temperature, and is designed to heat the place of steam and far more economical than the latter. If it should be adopted, it would save the government for heating its buildings here there will be "millions in it."

One of our most prominent merchants has on exhibition in his store window on Penna. Ave., the largest brook trout ever seen. It weighed ten pounds when caught in Rangleys Lake, Maine, and measured thirty inches from head to tail, and eighteen inches in circumference. It belongs to George Shepperd Page, of New York City, one of the best known fishermen in the country, and was sent here to a celebrated taxidermist to be mounted. It will be returned to New York this week.

An Embarrassing Rebuke. (From the Chicago Daily News.) Apropos of the President's journey, it is worth while to recall to-day that he did not expect the White House to invite the Chief Magistrate to dinner during Mr. Cleveland's stay in New York. There is a little story connected with this which is as interesting as it is true. Notwithstanding the abuse of the treatment of Gov. Cleveland in the columns of the Tribune, the editor of that paper addressed Cleveland a letter shortly after the election asking him to call upon him when he came to New York. This letter, it is unnecessary to say, was never answered.

When the President visited New York late in the winter for the purpose of meeting the leaders in the Democratic party, with whom he was unacquainted, Mr. Reid was one of the first to call and pay his respects. As he arose to leave he whispered in the President's ear: "You have not told me when you will be in New York." Looking him full in the face the President replied: "I read an able editorial in your paper a few weeks ago saying that I ate with my knife, and that my table manners were not those of a gentleman. I don't think, under the circumstances, that you will feel aggrieved at my refusing the invitation."

Mr. Reid, as the story goes, passed out of the room without another word.

The Contracts Forfeited. SECRETARY WHITNEY DECLARES THAT JOHN ROACH HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS AGREEMENT. Secretary Whitney has sent the following letter to John Roach and his attorney, in relation to the contract for the Chicago & North Western:

"By the tenth clause of your contract with the United States, dated July 26, 1883, for the construction of one steel car for about 4,500 tons displacement, it was agreed that the hull, machinery and fittings of such car should be completed and ready for inspection for the purpose of delivery on or before the expiration of eighteen months from the date of the contract. It was further provided in the eleventh clause that in the case of the failure or omission of the contractor, or at any stage of the work prior to final completion, from any cause other than the order of the Secretary of the Navy, to go forward with the work and make satisfactory progress towards its completion, it should be deemed a forfeiture of the contract.

More than six months have elapsed since the expiration of the limit thus fixed and the work upon the vessel has been stopped, while much remains to be done before she can be finally completed. At the same time it is evident that the public interests require the vessel in question, known as the

Chicago, to be completed with all practical speed, and it has therefore become necessary for the department to take immediate and definite action in regard to the contract.

Under these circumstances, and in consequence of the failure of the contractor to proceed with the work, I have to inform you that the contract above referred to is hereby declared to be forfeited on the part of the contractor and that the rights of the United States under the contract, and especially the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth clauses thereof, are now operative. You are further informed that it is the intention of the department, after the inventory and appraisal shall have been made, to take steps for the prosecution of the contract, and the completion of the said vessel in accordance with the conditions expressed in the contract; and that in the meantime, the chiefs of the Bureau of Steam Engineering and Repair of this department will take charge of the vessel, machinery and fittings thereof.

Similar letters also were sent in regard to the Atlanta and the Boston and an order issued to Chief Engineer and Chief Constructor Wilson directing them to take charge of the work. In issuing the order Secretary Whitney says:

"The order issued to-day with reference to the Boston, Atlanta and Chicago is made in pursuance of my duties under the eleventh clause of the contract. Under that clause there is to follow an inventory showing to what extent the contractor has complied with the contract, and what material is on hand in the contractor's yard which was provided for the ships and how far the work has progressed, to be followed by a valuation of these things. There is then a provision that the department shall decide whether to complete the ships.

He Meant to Shoot Grant. THE STORY THAT AN OFFICER IN LEA'S ARMY IS SAID TO HAVE RELATED AFTER THE WAR.

A writer in the New York Sun tells this story: A few months after the termination of the siege of Paris in 1870, I had acted as a special correspondent for an English newspaper. I was staying for a short time at the Grand Hotel in that city. While I was sipping coffee and smoking a cigar an American friend, Colonel W., entered and introduced me to a gentleman who accompanied him. We sat down at the little marble table and had a chat. The conversation soon became interesting, for all three were brimful of military anecdotes and reminiscences of the late war in France as well as of the war in America. Colonel W.'s friend, whose name has been forgotten, was a general in the army, and he related the following story, which is given as thoroughly reliable:

"Although the Colonel here and I were firm friends from the days of our youth, when the war of secession broke out, we were not intimate. We were, however, generally in the habit of being thrown into immediate personal contact during that dreadful period. I was always a headstrong, and impetuous sort of fellow, and a red-hot partisan of the Confederate cause. Toward the latter part of the war I had worked up a very temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats which we had recently sustained at the hands of General Grant had not worked upon my temperate and to the point of believing that nothing could save the Confederacy from destruction except some heroic deed of self-sacrifice. The continued series of defeats